



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,384	12/27/2000	Akira Oosawa	Q61247	3796
7590 02/04/2005 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3202			EXAMINER TABATABAI, ABOLFAZL	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/748,384	OOSAWA, AKIRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abolfazl Tabatabai	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/27/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Final Action

Response to Amendments/Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see (pages 13-18), filed August 24, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-52 under Some et al (U S 5,841,148); Branson (U S 5,740,801); Ishihara (5,241,473) and Gupta et al (6,292,683 B1) have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Therefore, This Office Action Made Final).
2. Applicant argues in essence that the prior art does not teach or suggest motion to create interlace noise. Examiner disagrees and indicates that [according to Branson the processor reduces interlaced noise on an interlaced video display device by reducing motion artifacts due to motion that occurs between acquisition of fields of video that comprise a video frame (column 26, lines 10-14)].
3. Applicant argues in essence that the prior art does not teach or suggest that the original images constitute " each of two or more pairs of original images selected from three or more original image". Examiner disagrees and indicates that [according to Branson images can be selected from all available images using database query mechanism, or by relationship to any criteria specified by the user, or other programs employed by the user, and the user has the option to select the maximum number of images to be displayed on a page on the selected device (see column 15, lines 31-45; column 16, lines 61-65 and column 18, lines 48-55)].
4. Applicant argues in essence that the prior art does not teach or suggest displaying two or more inter-image-processed images. Examiner disagrees and

Art Unit: 2625

indicates that Some teaches displaying two or more inter-image-processed images (see fig. 3 element 88 and column 10, lines 33-40).

5. Applicant argues in essence that the prior art does not teach or suggest the display-format setting. Examiner disagrees and indicates that Branson teaches display-format setting (see column 1, lines 46-50; column 3, lines 46-54 and column 6, lines 5-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 7, 13, 22, 23, 26, 32, 38, 47-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Some et al (U S 5,841,148) in view of Branson (U S 5,740,801).

Regarding claim 1, Some discloses image-processing apparatus comprising the steps of:

performing inter-image processing on two original images constituting each of two or more pairs of original images selected from three or more original images taken of the same subject, which become objects of comparison and reading (column 4, lines 1-32; column 11, lines 28-37 and column 13, lines 47-58).

However, Some is silent about the specific details regarding the step of:

Art Unit: 2625

arranging, or switching in sequence, and displaying two or more inter-image processed images generated by said inter-image processing.

In the same field of endeavor, however, Branson discloses managing information endoscopy system comprising the step of:

arranging, or switching in sequence, and displaying two or more inter-image processed images generated by said inter-image processing (column 2, lines 47-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use arranging, or switching in sequence, and displaying two or more inter-image processed as taught by Branson in the system of Some because Branson provides Some a system which performs a zooming function for increasing size of images on the output device and reduces interlaced noise on an interlaced video display device by reducing motion artifacts due to motion that occurs between acquisition of field of video that comprise a video frame.

Regarding claim 7, Some discloses image processing apparatus wherein one of said two original images is selected as a reference image so that each of said inter-image-processed images is generated based on said image (column 4, lines 1-26).

Regarding claim 13, Some discloses image processing apparatus wherein said inter-image processing is the process of performing subtraction between corresponding pixels in said two original images (column 5, lines 19-23 and column 11, lines 59-64).

Claim 22, is similarly analyzed as claim 1.

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 23, Some discloses image processing apparatus wherein said three or more images are medical radiation images (column 12, lines 47-51 and column 15, lines 14-40).

Regarding claim 26, Some discloses image-processing apparatus comprising the steps of:

Image display means (column 10, lines 21-37);

Inter-image processing means for performing inter-image processing on two original images constituting each of two or more pairs of original images selected from three or more original images taken of the same subject, which become objects of comparison and reading (column 4, lines 1-32; column 11, lines 28-37 and column 13, lines 47-58).

However, Some is silent about the specific details regarding the step of:

display-format setting means for causing said image display means to arrange, or switch in sequence; and displaying two or more inter-image processed images obtained by said inter-image processing means.

In the same field of endeavor (medical image), however, Branson discloses managing information endoscopy system comprising the step of:

display-format setting means for causing said image display means to arrange, or switch in sequence, and displaying two or more inter-image processed images obtained by said inter-image processing means (column 2, lines 47-55; column 7, lines 41-51 and column 8, lines 9-16).

Art Unit: 2625

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use display-format setting means for causing said image display means to arranging, or witching in sequence, and displaying two or more inter-image processed as taught by Branson in the system of Some because Branson provides Some a system which performs a zooming function for increasing size of images on the output device and reduces interlaced noise on an interlaced video display device by reducing motion artifacts due to motion that occurs between acquisition of field of video that comprise a video frame.

Claim 32 is similarly analyzed as claim 7.

Claim 38 is similarly analyzed as claim 13.

Claim 47, is similarly analyzed as claim 22.

Claim 48, is similarly analyzed as claim 23.

Claims 49-52 are similarly analyzed as claims 1 and 26 above.

Regarding claim 53, Some is silent about the specific details regarding the image display of claim 1, wherein the inter-image processing is automated.

In the same field of endeavor (medical image), however, Branson discloses managing information endoscopy system comprising the inter-image processing is automated (column 19, lines 26-29).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use inter-image is automated as taught by Branson in the system of Some because Branson provides Some a system which performs a zooming function for increasing size of images on the output device and reduces interlaced noise

Art Unit: 2625

on an interlaced video display device by reducing motion artifacts due to motion that occurs between acquisition of field of video that comprise a video frame.

Claim 54, is similarly analyzed as claim 53.

7. Claims 11 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Some et al (U S 5,841,148) and Branson (U S 5,740,801) as applied to claims 7 and 32 above, and further in view of Ishihara et al (5,241,473).

Regarding claim 11, Some and Branson are silent about the specific details regarding three or more original images are acquired in sequence in a time series manner, and said reference image is the newest or oldest in a time series.

In the same field of endeavor, however, Ishihara discloses a system for tracking motion in MR images comprising three or more original images are acquired in sequence in a time series manner, and said reference image is the newest or oldest in a time series (column 3, lines 34-38; column 12, lines 65-68; column 13, lines 1-8 and 26-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use reference image as taught by Ishihara in the system of Some because Ishihara provides Some a system in which the foregoing problems are solved in which movement of moving portion of patient's body such as a heart of blood vessels are depicted with colored differential images and display in a time series of the moving portion of the patient's body on a scope is produced, and is further possible to discriminate timing of the images relative to a biosignal of the patient.

Claim 36, is similarly analyzed as claim 11.

Art Unit: 2625

8. Claims 2-6, 8-10,12, 14-21,24-25, 27-31, 33-35, 37 and 40-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Some et al (U S 5,841,148) and Branson (U S 5,740,801) as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Gupta et al (6,292,683 B1).

Regarding claim 2, Some and Branson are silent about the specific details regarding the image display method wherein said two or more inter-image-processed images are arranged in a manner in which display positions of structurally characteristic parts of said subject in said two or more inter-image-processed images are aligned. In the same field of endeavor, however, Gupta discloses a system for tracking motion in MR images comprising the image display method wherein said two or more inter-image-processed images are arranged in a manner in which display positions of structurally characteristic parts of said subject in said two or more inter-image-processed images are aligned (column 6, lines 29-39 and column 9, lines 51-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use alignment as taught by Gupta in the system of Some. Because Gupta provides Some a system to track movement in MR images that solves the aforementioned problems. In one application, an automatic image registration algorithm is proposed which greatly reduces the time required for analyzing MR studies and improves the accuracy of signal intensity analysis. This automatic image registration system is particularly advantageous in myocardial perfusion imaging, coronary artery imaging diffusion system, and medical instrument tracking in an interventional procedure.

Regarding claim 3, Some and Branson are silent about the specific details regarding two or more inter-image-processed images are switched in sequence in a manner in which display positions of structurally characteristic parts of said subject in said two or more inter-image-processed images are registered.

In the same field of endeavor, however, Gupta discloses a system for tracking motion in MR images comprising two or more inter-image-processed images are switched in sequence in a manner in which display positions of structurally characteristic parts of said subject in said two or more inter-image-processed images are registered (column 4, lines 17-26 and column 6, lines 25-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use registered images as taught by Gupta in the system of Some. Because Gupta provides some a system to track movement in MR images that solves the aforementioned problems. In one application, an automatic image registration algorithm is proposed which greatly reduces the time required for analyzing MR studies and improves the accuracy of signal intensity analysis. This automatic image registration system is particularly advantageous in myocardial perfusion imaging, coronary artery imaging diffusion system, and medical instrument tracking in an interventional procedure.

Regarding claim 4, Some and Branson are silent about the specific details regarding three or more original images are taken in sequence in a time series manner.

Art Unit: 2625

In the same field of endeavor, however, Gupta discloses a system for tracking motion in MR images comprising three or more original images are taken in sequence in a time series manner (column 3, lines 27-33 and column 6, lines 29-39).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use time series manner as taught by Gupta in the system of Some because Gupta provides Some a system to track movement in MR images that solves the aforementioned problems. In one application, an automatic image registration algorithm is proposed which greatly reduces the time required for analyzing MR studies and improves the accuracy of signal intensity analysis. This automatic image registration system is particularly advantageous in myocardial perfusion imaging, coronary artery imaging diffusion system, and medical instrument tracking in an interventional procedure.

Claims 5 and 6 are similarly analyzed as claim 4.

Claims 8-10 are similarly analyzed as claim 7.

Claim 12, is similarly analyzed as claim 4.

Claim 14, is similarly analyzed as claim 13.

Claim 15, is similarly analyzed as claim 13.

Regarding claim 16, Some and Branson are silent about the specific details regarding inter-image processing is the process of registering positions of structural elements of said two original images.

In the same field of endeavor, however, Gupta discloses a system for tracking motion in MR images comprising inter-image processing is the process of registering positions of

Art Unit: 2625

structural elements of said two original images (column 4, lines 20-26 and column 6, lines 29-39).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use registering positions as taught by Gupta in the system of Some because Gupta provides Some a system to track movement in MR images that solves the aforementioned problems. In one application, an automatic image registration algorithm is proposed which greatly reduces the time required for analyzing MR studies and improves the accuracy of signal intensity analysis. This automatic image registration system is particularly advantageous in myocardial perfusion imaging, coronary artery imaging diffusion system, and medical instrument tracking in an interventional procedure.

Claims 17-21 are similarly analyzed as claim 16.

Claims 24 and 25 are similarly analyzed as claim 12.

Claim 27, is similarly analyzed as claim 2.

Claim 28, is similarly analyzed as claim 3.

Claims 29-31, 36-37 are similarly analyzed as claim 4.

Claim 33, is similarly analyzed as claim 7.

Claim 34, is similarly analyzed as claim 28.

Claim 35, is similarly analyzed as claim 29.

Claim 37, is similarly analyzed as claim 25.

Claims 39 and 40 are similarly analyzed as claim 13.

Claims 41-46 are similarly analyzed as claim 16.

Other prior art Cited

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Taniguchi (U S 5,578,823) discloses a transmission electron microscope and method of observing element distribution by using the same.

Fujii et al (U S 5,594,768) disclose a laminograph and inspection and repair device using the same

Ishihara et al (U S 6,110,123) disclose a region of interest setting apparatus for respiration monitoring and a respiration monitoring system.

Yonekawa (U S 6,504,897 B1) disclose a X-ray image radiographing system.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to ABOLFAZL TABATABAI whose telephone number is (703) 306-5917.

The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mehta Bhavesh M, can be reached at (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abolfazl Tabatabai

Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/748,384

Page 14

Art Unit: 2625

Group Art Unit 2625

January 31, 2005


KANJIBHAI PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER